



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

ART. VI.—*On the Orthography of some of the later Royal names of Assyrian and Babylonian history.*

[Read 18th Nov., 1854.]

TO THE SECRETARY OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

SIR,

Baghdad, October 2, 1854.

MUCH as I dislike discussions which have anything of the character of controversy, I am tempted by the interest I naturally take in Cuneiform research, to put together a few explanatory notes, with a view of remedying the confusion that Dr. Hincks's recent publications in the *Literary Gazette*<sup>1</sup> have introduced into certain later portions of the Assyrian and Babylonian history.

I have nothing to say at present to Dr. Hincks's chronology of Sargon and Sennacherib, agreeing as I generally do with his dates from B.C. 722 to 680, but it must not be lost sight of that we both take our stand on the numbers employed in Ptolemy's canon, or rather on the agreement between the canon and the inscriptions, in regard to a consecutive series of dates relatively to each other, and that we are as yet entirely unsupported by Greek, Hebrew, or Egyptian synchronisms. If then it should so happen that there is any radical error in Ptolemy's chronology, the era of Nabonassar for instance not having really commenced on February 26th, B.C. 747, or the subsequent Chaldean dates being improperly adapted to the Egyptian calendar (and Dr. Hincks's own observations on the Assyrian intercalation would seem to show that this is not improbable); if, I say, we are thus founding on erroneous premises, then our conclusions, though relatively correct, will be positively wrong.

Under such circumstances, I am disposed to treat with every respect Mr. Bosanquet's proposed rectifications, founded on astronomical calculations, which it may be presumed are of the utmost precision, and I shall wait for the verification or otherwise of Ptolemy's dates, by the application to his eclipses (recorded as far back as the reign of Merodach Baladan), of the same astronomical test which Mr. Bosanquet has already applied to the eclipses of Thales and Hezekiah, before I undertake either to support or to modify my published views on the Assyrian chronology; but with regard to the historical nomenclature no such reserve is necessary.

<sup>1</sup> See No. 1044, of April 22, 1854, and No. 1059, of August 5, 1854.

Dr. Hincks's views on the later Assyrian succession, so far as I can understand them, may be thus stated:

Sennacherib had two sons; the elder, *Assur-nadin*, and the younger *Assur-akh-iddin* (the Ἀσπυρδάειος and Ἀσσυράδηνος of the canon); and the latter, who was the Esar-Haddon of Scripture, had again three sons, *Assur-bani-bal*, *Assur-yuchura-bal*, and *Shamas-akh-iddan*, of whom the two first reigned successively in Assyria on the death of their father, and the third synchronously with his brothers in Babylonia.

Now this latter triumvirate is certainly fictitious, depending altogether on a mistaken reading of the Cuneiform names; and even the distinction of the two sons of Sennacherib, to which I was formerly opposed, requires some explanation.

The name of the eldest son of Sennacherib, who was placed in the government of Babylonia, on the second expulsion of Merodach Baladan, in the former king's fourth year, is written, on every monument which I have examined, as  $\text{𐎶} \rightarrow \text{𐎶} \rightarrow \text{𐎶} \rightarrow \text{𐎶} \rightarrow \text{𐎶}$ . On one of the Koyunjik bulls, however, according to Mr. Layard's copy (B. M. series, pl. 61, l. 5), the variant reading is found of  $\text{𐎶} \rightarrow \text{𐎶} \rightarrow \text{𐎶} \rightarrow \text{𐎶} \rightarrow \text{𐎶}$ . This then is the name which I used to suppose to be the same as Esar-Haddon (for reasons that I shall presently explain), and which Dr. Hincks appears now to read as *Assur-nadin*, regarding the final  $\rightarrow \text{𐎶}$  either as a separate word ("by name" ?), or as a non-phonetic adjunct. The reason why I formerly confounded this king with Esar-Haddon, whose name is generally spelt as  $\text{𐎶} \rightarrow \text{𐎶} \rightarrow \text{𐎶} \rightarrow \text{𐎶} \rightarrow \text{𐎶}$  or  $\text{𐎶} \rightarrow \text{𐎶} \rightarrow \text{𐎶} \rightarrow \text{𐎶} \rightarrow \text{𐎶}$ , was that I had positive proof of the first and third elements of the two names being identical, and that I thus fancied  $\rightarrow \text{𐎶} \rightarrow \text{𐎶}$  or  $\rightarrow \text{𐎶} \rightarrow \text{𐎶}$  might be exceptionally used for *akh*; but upon mature consideration I do not think that explanation tenable, and I now propose therefore to read  $\text{𐎶} \rightarrow \text{𐎶} \rightarrow \text{𐎶} \rightarrow \text{𐎶} \rightarrow \text{𐎶}$  or  $\text{𐎶} \rightarrow \text{𐎶} \rightarrow \text{𐎶} \rightarrow \text{𐎶} \rightarrow \text{𐎶}$  as *Asshur-nadin-iddina*, "Asshur is the giver of the gift."<sup>1</sup>

It will perhaps appear strange to Dr. Hincks that I should read

<sup>1</sup> I may here observe that one element of the royal names of Assyria and Babylonia is usually a monogram, representing a verbal root, which may be pronounced as a participle, or the aorist, or even as the verbal noun:  $\rightarrow \text{𐎶}$  or  $\rightarrow \text{𐎶}$  thus represents the root *nadan* "to give," and may be pronounced as *nadin*, or *iddin*, or perhaps even as *adin*.



































𐎶𐎵 as *iddina*, regarding it as a monogram for the root "to give," absolutely equal to 𐎶𐎵𐎶, but I believe there is positive proof of this identity; for on one of the Nabonit cylinders found at Mugheir, the king of Assyria who repairs a temple at Babylon, and who can be no other than Esar Haddon, is named 𐎶 𐎶𐎵𐎶 𐎶𐎵𐎶 𐎶𐎵𐎶 *Asshur-akh-iddina*, the last element answering to the ordinary 𐎶 or 𐎶𐎵𐎶; and again, on Lord Aberdeen's stone, which I stated long ago to belong to Esar-Haddon,<sup>1</sup> and which it does, I confess, surprise me to find Dr. Hincks still attributing to a spurious *Shamas-akh-iddan*, there is an example of the same variant orthography; the king's name in col. 1, l. 1, being written 𐎶𐎵𐎶 𐎶𐎵𐎶 𐎶𐎵𐎶 𐎶𐎵𐎶, and in col. 2, l. 18, as 𐎶𐎵𐎶 𐎶𐎵𐎶 𐎶𐎵𐎶 𐎶𐎵𐎶. In many other names too, such as 𐎶 𐎶𐎵𐎶 𐎶𐎵𐎶 𐎶𐎵𐎶 𐎶𐎵𐎶, *Merodach-nadin-iddina*, 𐎶 𐎶𐎵𐎶 𐎶𐎵𐎶 𐎶𐎵𐎶 𐎶𐎵𐎶, *Nabu-nadin-iskun*, &c., the same power is to be recognized.



I now proceed, however, to the more important question of the three sons of Esar-haddon, and I reiterate what I published in the *Athenæum* of March 18th, 1854, that the king in question was succeeded by his son, *Asshur-bani-pal*, and that Dr. Hincks's *Asurguchura-bal* and *Shamas-akh-iddan* have no existence. The name of this son of Esar-Haddon, who succeeded his father on the throne, is composed, as usual, of three elements; 1stly, *Asshur*, 𐎶𐎵𐎶, or 𐎶𐎵𐎶; 2ndly, *bani*, the participle of 𐎶𐎵𐎶 written 𐎶𐎵 or 𐎶𐎵𐎶; and 3dly, 𐎶, or 𐎶𐎵𐎶 𐎶𐎵𐎶, *bal* or *pal*, "a son," so that it means "Asshur is the creator of a son."

It is singular that Dr. Hincks should not have discovered that the sign 𐎶𐎵, amongst its various uses, represents the root 𐎶𐎵𐎶, and is pronounced *bani*, as there are hundreds of examples of this employment of the character in the inscriptions;<sup>2</sup> but it is more singular still that he should have affixed to the letter in question the power of




































<sup>1</sup> See the last note to my letter in the *Athenæum* of March 18, 1854.

<sup>2</sup> Thus on the Chaldean bricks "builder" of the palace or temple is written indifferently 𐎶𐎵 𐎶𐎵 and 𐎶𐎵 𐎶𐎵, *banu* and *mubani*, &c., &c.

*yuchura*,<sup>1</sup> as it involves a double error; firstly, that of mistaking the letter  for , in the name of              , and secondly, that of attributing the name in question to Nabopolassar, the father of Nebuchadnezzar, instead of to Nabonidus. From the first moment when I examined the Warka tablets in the British Museum, and copied the dates, which Dr. Hincks appears to think he has recently discovered,<sup>2</sup> I had very little doubt but that the name                   referred to Nabunit, and I published this identification above three years ago, (*Jour. R. A. S.*, vol. xiv, part 1 p. 9, note 2.)<sup>3</sup> The reading has since been confirmed by a hundred

<sup>1</sup> I may here note, that  the final element in so many Babylonian names, is the monogram for the root  "to protect;" and is, I believe, always pronounced as the participle *ulsur*, or *ulsur*, rather than as the aorist *yulsur*.

<sup>2</sup> These dates, which Dr. Hincks announced to the Trustees as discoveries in April of the present year, were communicated by me to Mr. Birch and Mr. Vaux, early in 1851, on being permitted to examine the Warka tablets, in their rooms at the Museum.

<sup>3</sup> The last letter of the name is, in the passage here referred to, incorrectly printed as . The true form is  or , (No. 224 of my alphabet), of which the ordinary phonetic power is *duk*. In this name, I presume that  must be a determinative, and that  represents some object of which the name is *nit*. It is however just possible that the name          may be pronounced phonetically *Nabu-induk*, or *Nabo-induk*, answering in fact to the *Ναβαννίδουχος* of Abydenus, as quoted by Eusebius, and to the *Ναβοάνωνλος* of Berossus, as quoted by Josephus; and in the latter form I would further suggest that the λ was the error of a copyist for χ; at any rate it is quite certain that the same king, whose name is generally written *Ναβόννηος*, or *Ναβόννιδος*, has also the appellation of *Nabannidoch* and *Naboandel* (for *Naboandech*), precisely as in the inscriptions the two names of            or          are used indifferently. The explanation also which I would offer of this singular jumble is as follows: the verbal element in names may be pronounced as the aorist or the participle, apparently at option. In this name I suppose the root to be , which is constantly used in the inscriptions with a great variety of meanings; here it probably means "to console," *Nabu-nit* (for *Nabu-nid*, the final sonant being always sharpened) signifying "Nebo the comforter," while *Nabu-induk* is "Nebo consoles you." I confess I have never seen any other instance of a pronominal suffix being added at option in the composition of a proper name; but there must, I presume, be some such irregularity to account for the discrepancy of orthography which occurs both in the Greek and Cuneiform rendering of the name.

examples, Nabunit naming himself on his bricks and cylinders indifferently  $\rightarrow\text{I}$   $\rightarrow\text{E}$   $\rightarrow\text{E}$ , or  $\rightarrow\text{I}$   $\rightarrow\text{E}$   $\rightarrow\text{I}$   $\rightarrow\text{E}$   $\rightarrow\text{E}$ , or  $\rightarrow\text{I}$   $\rightarrow\text{E}$   $\rightarrow\text{E}$   $\rightarrow\text{E}$   $\rightarrow\text{E}$ , and the three several and equivalent forms occurring not unfrequently in the course of the same inscription.

I do not pretend at present to explain how it happens that  $\rightarrow\text{E}$   $\rightarrow\text{E}$   $\rightarrow\text{E}$  has the phonetic power of *nit*, but the fact is undoubted, and Dr. Hincks therefore must abandon all his readings of *Nabu-bin-yuchur*, *Shamsi bin*, *Ben-Hadad*, *Assur-yuchura-bal*, together with his three sons of Esar-Haddon, and a number of other historical illustrations, which he has recently delivered "ex cathedra," with the same confidence that characterizes his announcement of genuine readings, and which are thus calculated to mislead enquiry, and to retard the progress of discovery.

The only single addition which I have to make to my sketch of Assyrian history, as published in the *Athenæum* of March, 1854, is, that in the S. E. palace at Nimrud many relics have been recently found of the son of *Asshur-bani-pal*, whom I name provisionally *Asshur-emit-ili*,<sup>1</sup> and that under this king, who reigned probably from B.C. 645 to 625, must therefore be placed both the Scythian inroad and the destruction of Nineveh by the Medes.

H. C. RAWLINSON.

*Letter from Dr. Hincks, in reply to Colonel Rawlinson's Note on the Successor of Sennacherib.*

*Killyleigh, Co. Down, 29th Nov. 1854.*




Dear Sir.

I observe that a communication from Colonel Rawlinson was read at the last meeting of the Royal Asiatic Society, containing what he conceived to be rectifications of statements made by me in a report and letter of mine published in the *Literary Gazette*. I trust the Society will accept a communication from me, tending to show that these are by no means rectifications.

Of Colonel Rawlinson's two objections, the first is of little importance. He says that the true name of the eldest son of Sennacherib is not *Assur-nadin*, but *Assur-nadin-iddin*. I have met with this name in three different forms in three different Bull inscriptions copied by Mr. Layard. In one the name is distinctly *Assur-nadin*. In the

<sup>1</sup> Meaning perhaps "Asshur is the chief of (*il*, stands over) the gods."

other two an addition to this is found, which I at first read *sumi*. Afterwards, I found an explanation of the *whole* conclusion of the name on a tablet in the British Museum, from which I inferred that it should be pronounced *nadin*, without any addition. Unfortunately I have mislaid my notes of the inscription on this tablet; and I am therefore unable to give my reasons for thus reading it more specifically than I have done. It is a matter of but little moment.

All the other points of difference to which Colonel Rawlinson has referred in his communication may be reduced to this:—A certain royal name appears on tablets in the British Museum, and on bricks found at Babylon on the river side, which Colonel Rawlinson believes to be a variant of the name of *Nabu-nahid* (or, as he calls him, *Nabu-nit*), who began to reign in 555 B.C.; but which I believe to be a variant of the name of Nabopolassar, who began to reign seventy years earlier. The question is, which of us is right? That it is one or other of these kings seems pretty evident; for the father of this king is mentioned, and he was not a king. He was, according to Colonel Rawlinson, *Nabu-dirba*, and filled the high office of "*rubu-emga*." Colonel Rawlinson has adduced, in support of his theory, a statement of Berossus that Nabunit executed some considerable works at Babylon; but Berossus mentions the outer walls of the city as all that he built; whereas the bricks are from the river side. On the other hand, in the great inscription at the India House, Nebuchadnezzar distinctly mentions these works by the river side, as having been completed by himself; they having been commenced by his father, Nabopolassar, whose bricks might, therefore, be naturally expected to be found in their foundations. Besides, if Mr. Layard's copies be correct, the final character in the disputed name is interchanged with one which is interchanged with the character which ordinarily expresses the last element in the names of Nebuchadnezzar and his father,—*yuchur*, as I read it. That is to say,  is interchanged with , which is interchanged with . On these grounds, I must retain my opinion as to the person to whom this name belongs; and of course I attach no weight to the objections brought against my other readings, that they are dependent upon, or connected with, this. The rectification which appears to me most needed is that Colonel Rawlinson should cease to attribute to Nabunahid the bricks and the buildings and the parentage of Nabopolassar.

Believe me to remain, yours very truly,

E. Norris, Esq.

Edw. Hincks.